



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,531	04/15/2004	Hisashi Shinkai	228161	8241
23460 7590 01/03/2007 LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900 180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE CHICAGO, IL 60601-6731			EXAMINER MAIER, LEIGH C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1623	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/03/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/825,531

Applicant(s)

SHINKAI ET AL.

Examiner

Leigh C. Maier

Art Unit

1623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 35-45 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19, 21 and 23-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 20 and 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-18 are canceled. Claims 19-45 are newly added and are pending. The claims are now limited to a single compound, its use in therapeutic methods and in the preparation of another compound.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the compound, per se, and salts, does not reasonably provide enablement for the full scope of hydrates and solvates claimed. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Many of the factors regarding undue experimentation have been summarized in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Circ. 1988) as follows:

- (1) The quantity of experimentation necessary (time and expense);
- (2) The amount of direction or guidance presented;
- (3) The presence or absence of working examples of the invention;
- (4) The nature of the invention;
- (5) The state of the prior art;
- (6) The relative skill of those in the art;
- (7) The predictability or unpredictability of the art; and
- (8) The breadth of the claims.

Art Unit: 1623

The claims are drawn to all theoretical solvates and hydrates of the compound (compound 10 in the specification) that might be prepared. However, the specification does not disclose any isolated hydrates or solvates. Neither does it provide any guidance as to their preparation. It is not clear how broad the claims are because it is not possible to predict the number of hydrates and/or solvates that might be prepared. Vippagunta et al (Adv. Drug Deliv. Rev., 2001) addresses the state of the art with respect to the preparation of these types of formulations. See section 3. "The mere presence of water in a system is not a sufficient reason to expect hydrate formation, because some compounds, though they are soluble in water, do not form hydrates." Section 3.1. It is not known if compound 10 is capable of forming hydrates and/or solvates, much less how many might be formed. In view of the foregoing, one of ordinary skill would require undue experimentation to make and use the inventive product commensurate with the scope of the claims.

Claims 23-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The claims are drawn to a variety of therapeutic methods related to the inhibition of CETP activity in a patient comprising the administration of compound 10. Some of the claims recite the use of solvates and hydrates. The lack of enablement with respect to these compounds is addressed above. With respect to the enabled compound, it is noted that there does not appear to be any data regarding CETP inhibition by this compound in the specification. The compound

Art Unit: 1623

has been reported to have this activity in post-filing publications. However, it has also been reported that this compound and other similar thiols are unstable. See (1) Okamoto et al (Nature, 2000) at Table 1 and page 204, 1st full paragraph; (2) Shinkai et al (J. Med. Chem., 2000) at Table 3 and page 3269, 1st full paragraph; and (3) Okamoto et al (Eur. J. Pharmacol., 2003) at section 4, "Discussion." From these references, it appears that although the compound has high CETP activity, the thiol form is not stable enough to be effective in routine administration. The specification does not suggest any particular instability of this compound. Nor does it provide guidance regarding any special method of administration that would be required in order to deliver this compound, so that it would be efficacious *in vivo*. In view of the post-filing publications, it is not clear that there is any method wherein the compound could be administered in a way to provide the proper therapeutic effect. Although the skill in the art would be expected to be high, one of ordinary skill would require undue experimentation in order to make and use the compounds commensurate with the scope of the claimed invention.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 35-45 are allowed. Collings et al (Tetrahedron, 1964 – STN Document No. 62:3057, of record) discloses thiols similar in structure to the thiol intermediate of claim 35 and the compound of claim 19. This reference does not teach or fairly suggest the instant thiol compound. Claims 20 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 1623

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1623

Examiner's hours, phone & fax numbers

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leigh Maier whose telephone number is (571) 272-0656. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday 7:00 to 3:30 (ET).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Anna Jiang (571) 272-0627, may be contacted. The fax number for Group 1600, Art Unit 1623 is (571) 273-8300.

Visit the U.S. PTO's site on the World Wide Web at <http://www.uspto.gov>. This site contains lots of valuable information including the latest PTO fees, downloadable forms, basic search capabilities and much more. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished application is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov> Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197.

Leigh C. Maier

Leigh C. Maier
Primary Examiner
December 22, 2006